IN THE HIGH COURT OF UTTRANCHAL
AT NAINITAL

Second Appeal No. 814 of 2001
(Old No. 184 of 1992)

Mela Ram Sahnia s/o Late Sri Karam Chand Shania
R/o 18 Circular Road, Dehradun
District Dehradun .....Appellant

Vs.

1. The Director, KDMIPE
   Oil & Natural Gas Commission
   Dehradun
2. The Chairman
   Oil & Natural Gas Commission
   Tel Bhawan, Dehradun
3. The Oil & Natural Gas Commission
   A Body Corporate having its Head Office
   Of Tel Bhawan, Dehradun ...Respondents

Sri Rajendra Dobhal, learned counsel for the appellant
Sri. J.P. Joshi, learned counsel for the respondents

Hon'ble B.C. Kandpal, J.

This second appeal has been preferred by the appellant against the judgment and decree dated 25.05.1992 and 06.06.1992 passed by Additional District Judge/Special Judge, Anti Corruption, U.P. (East), Dehradun in Civil Appeal No. 22 of 1991 arising out of the judgment and decree dated 19.12.1989 passed by Munsif, Dehradun in Original Suit No. 332 of 1982.

2. Brief facts of the case are that the plaintiff/appellant filed a suit before the Minsif, Dehradun which was dismissed vide judgment and decree dated 19.12.1989.

3. Feeling aggrieved by the aforesaid judgment and decree, the plaintiff/appellant preferred an appeal before the

appellate court which was also dismissed vide judgment and decree dated 25.05.1992.

4. Feeling aggrieved by the aforesaid judgments and decree, the plaintiff/appellant preferred an appeal before this Court.

5. Heard Sri Rajendra Dobhal, learned counsel for the appellant on the point of admission and perused the record.

6. Having considered the arguments advanced by the learned counsel for the appellant and after perusing the entire evidence on record, I am of the view that, this second appeal is concluded by concurrent finding of facts, I, therefore, do not find any ground to interfere in the impugned judgments and orders passed by the courts below. Both the courts below have recorded concurrent finding of fact, which cannot be interfered at the stage of second appeal. I also do not find any substantial question of law involved in this case.

7. The second appeal lacks merit and is liable to be dismissed.

8. Accordingly, the second appeal is dismissed in-limine.

(B.C. Kandpal, J.)

08.12.2006
ASWAL